

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner in advance for review and reconsideration of this Amendment and accompanying changes. The paragraphs are numbered to correspond to the Office Action of October 20, 2005 for ease in identification.

1-2. The applicants thank the Examiner for entry of the prior amendments and request entry of the amendment included herein. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 8-13 and 15-18 are pending and stand rejected, claims 25 and 26 have been added, and claims 1-7, 14, and 19-24 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein. The amendments to claims 1 and 9 are primarily clerical, and are supported in the same place as prior amendments to those claims. Support for new claims 25 and 26 is found in the first full paragraph on page three, as well as the table on page. Support for the claims in the priority document is found in the equivalent locations to the previously cited paragraphs, as well as in original claim 2.

Priority

5. The applicants thank the Examiner for recognition of the priority document submitted in the previous response.

6. The office action states that claims 8-13 and 15-18 do not properly benefit under 35 U.S.C. § 120 by the earlier filing dates of the priority documents claimed, because those claims allegedly lack written description. The applicants respectfully disagree with this conclusion; argument to that effect is set forth below, in the section captioned "New Grounds of Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112."

Grounds of Objection and Rejection Withdrawn

7. The applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawal of those objections and rejections previously stated in the March 3, 2005, office action, but not repeated herein.

Grounds of Objection and Rejection Maintained

8. The applicants respectfully submit that the requirements of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment are satisfied by the amendments to the specification as presented herein. This objection is therefore moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

10. The office action rejects claims 8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Karsten *et al.* Applicants submit that, as set forth herein, those claims are entitled to a priority date that removes Karsten *et al.* as a potential reference. The rejection has been traversed, and the claims should be allowed.

New Grounds of Objection

11. The rejection of claims 8 and 10-13 has been mooted by introduction of an amendment as suggested by the Examiner. The objection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

12. The rejection of claim 9 for alleged redundancy has been mooted by amendment to removed any possible redundancy. The objection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

New Grounds of Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112]

13. Claims 8-13 and 15-18 stand rejected for alleged failure to comply with the written description requirement. The applicants respectfully traverse. Initially, applicants note that they did not include a translation of the claims of the original priority document with their submission of the initial translation. That is remedied by inclusion herein of a translation of those claims, as well as a certification that the translation is true and correct.

The applicants respectfully submit that, in addition to those places previously cited, the claims are supported in the original filing and in the priority document at original claim 1. That claim is directed to "synthetic peptides of a different length." One skilled in the art would, in

comparison to claim 2, for instance, recognize that such synthetic peptides could include fragments of the human epithelial mucin MUC1. The amended claims are adequately supported by the specification and claims of both and application as filed and of the priority document. The rejection should be removed and the claims allowed.


New Grounds of Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

15. Claims 9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly anticipated by Karsten, *et al.* For the same reasons given above in the applicants' response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Karsten *et al.* is antedated by the priority date of this application, and Karsten is not a competent reference. The rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully believed that the present application is in condition for examination and allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided. It is believed that no excess claims fees are required. If they are, kindly deduct the necessary amount from Deposit Account No. 02-4553, in the name of Buchanan Ingersoll PC.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: December 20, 2005

Duane A. Stewart III
Registration No. 54,468
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
ph: (412) 562-1622
fx: (412) 562-1041